



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/737,341	12/16/2003	Russell L. Holden	LOT920030052US1	9103

23550 7590 11/29/2006

HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC  
75 STATE STREET  
14TH FLOOR  
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER
----------

VAUTROT, DENNIS L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/737,341	HOLDEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis L. Vautrot	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/13/2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The applicants' amendment, filed 13 September 2006, has been received, entered into the record and considered.
2. As a result of the amendment, claim 15 is amended. Claims 1 – 22 are pending in the application.

### ***Specification***

3. The objection to the specification is withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. The §101 rejection has been overcome by the amendment to claim 15.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2167

6. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Benson** (5,819,272).

7. Regarding claim 1, **Benson** teaches a method for preventing an unread activity from being bounced-back to an originating server during a replication operation, comprising: storing an identification of an originating server of a replicated unread activity in an unread log of a receiving server (See column 4, lines 16-18 "Per\_User\_GUID 36 is the globally unique identifier of the replica server to which the master copy was last copied."); and during a subsequent replication process initiated by the receiving server, preventing replication of the unread activity back to the originating server (See column 4, lines 43-49 "In the process of opening communication with the assigned replica, the Per\_User\_GUID stored in the master copy is compared to the GUID of the server on which the assigned replica is stored (step 54). If the Per\_User\_GUID is the same, it means that this is the same replica of this folder that the user accessed previously, and no action is required before the replica is opened.")

8. Regarding claims 2, 9, and 16, **Benson** teaches during the subsequent replication process, replicating the unread activity to at least one other server not identified as the originating server (See column 4, lines 49-53 "If the Per\_User\_GUID is different, it means that a replica different from the last one has been accessed, and the per user read/unread data record 28 is copied to the replica, where it is stored on disk and in RAM.")

9. Regarding claims 3, 10, and 17, **Benson** teaches storing an identification further comprises: updating the unread log to include an unread entry corresponding to the replicated unread activity (See column 4, lines 57-59 "If it has changed, the read/unread data record 28 is written back to disk on the replica and on the user's home server (64)..."); and storing the identification of the originating server with the unread entry (See column 4, lines 59-61 "...with the replica's GUID written over the existing Per\_User\_GUID.")

10. Regarding claims 4, 11, and 18, **Benson** teaches preventing the replication of the unread activity back to the originating server further comprises: examining the unread log to determine if any unread entries stored therein correspond to an unread activity received from the originating server (See column 4, lines 43-49 "In the process of opening communication with the assigned replica, the Per\_User\_GUID stored in the master copy is compared to the GUID of the server on which the assigned replica is stored (step 54). If the Per\_User\_GUID is the same, it means that this is the same replica of this folder that the user accessed previously, and no action is required before the replica is opened."); and, during the subsequent replication process, not replicating any unread activity identified as being received from the originating server back to the originating server (See column 4, lines 60-61 "If the read/unread data set has not changed, no write back occurs.")

11. Regarding claims 5, 12, and 19, **Benson** teaches the originating server has a name (See column 5, lines 6-9 "In the preferred embodiment, a change number consists of a globally unique ID (GUID) of the server on which the change was made, plus a unique sequence number assigned by the server." Here the GUID is the name of the originating server.); and wherein the identification is a hash of the name of the originating server (See column 5, lines 35-38 "...it is possible to represent the set very efficiently, using the compression technique disclosed by my copending application entitled 'Compressing Sets of Integers', filed on even data herewith.")

12. Regarding claims 6, 13, and 20, **Benson** teaches during the subsequent replication process, if another server has the same hash as the originating server, the receiving server replicates the unread activity to the other server and back to the originating server (See column 5, lines 60-62 and 56-58 "First, it is determined whether the message is a replication conflict message (step 70)...All replicas would independently recognize the conflict, and build identical replication conflict messages.")

13. Regarding claims 7, 14, and 21, **Benson** teaches the originating server discards any duplicate replicated unread activities (See column 5, line 67 – column 6, line 4 "If the message is not a replication conflict message, then its singular CN is compared to CNs\_Marked\_Read\_Or\_Deleted (step 72), and the message is marked read (step 76) if the CN is contained in the set. Otherwise it is marked unread (step 78).")

Art Unit: 2167

14. Regarding claim 8, **Benson** teaches a bounce-back prevention system, comprising: a receiving server for receiving an unread activity replicated by an originating server, the receiving server including an unread log for storing an identification of the originating server (See column 4, lines 16-18 "Per\_User\_GUID 36 is the globally unique identifier of the replica server to which the master copy was last copied."); and a system for preventing replication of the unread activity back to the originating server during a subsequent replication process initiated by the receiving server (See column 4, lines 43-49 "In the process of opening communication with the assigned replica, the Per\_User\_GUID stored in the master copy is compared to the GUID of the server on which the assigned replica is stored (step 54). If the Per\_User\_GUID is the same, it means that this is the same replica of this folder that the user accessed previously, and no action is required before the replica is opened.").

15. Regarding claim 15, **Benson** teaches a program product stored on a recordable medium (See column 2, line 65 – column 3, line 4) for preventing an unread activity from being bounced-back to an originating server during a replication operation, which when executed on a computer system comprises: program code for storing an identification of an originating server of a replicated unread activity in an unread log of a receiving server (See column 4, lines 16-18 "Per\_User\_GUID 36 is the globally unique identifier of the replica server to which the master copy was last copied."); and program code for preventing replication of the unread activity back to the originating server, during a subsequent replication process initiated by the receiving server (See column 4,

Art Unit: 2167

process of opening communication with the assigned replica, the Per\_User\_GUID stored in the master copy is compared to the GUID of the server on which the assigned replica is stored (step 54). If the Per\_User\_GUID is the same, it means that this is the same replica of this folder that the user accessed previously, and no action is required before the replica is opened.”)

16. Regarding claim 22, **Benson** teaches a method for preventing an unread activity from being bounced-back to at least one originating server during a replication operation, comprising: storing an identification of each originating server of a replicated unread activity in an unread log of a receiving server (See column 4, lines 16-18 “Per\_User\_GUID 36 is the globally unique identifier of the replica server to which the master copy was last copied.”); and during a subsequent replication process initiated by the receiving server, preventing replication of the unread activity back to each originating server (See column 4, lines 43-49 “In the process of opening communication with the assigned replica, the Per\_User\_GUID stored in the master copy is compared to the GUID of the server on which the assigned replica is stored (step 54). If the Per\_User\_GUID is the same, it means that this is the same replica of this folder that the user accessed previously, and no action is required before the replica is opened.”)

### ***Response to Arguments***

17. Applicant's arguments filed in the amendment dated 13 September 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.



18. The arguments regarding claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 relate to the two main prongs of the independent claims.

19. First, pertaining to the argument that “Per\_User\_GUID 36 is the ‘identifier of the replica server to which the master copy was last copied.’” While it does say that the Per\_User\_GUID represents the ID of the replica server, conceptually, however, the replica server becomes the originating server as soon as the changes that are made on a server are passed on to the next server. Specifically, in column 4, lines 57 – 60, the replica’s GUID is written over the existing Per\_User\_GUID when the read/unread data set is modified. This makes the new Per\_User\_GUID the originating server. “If it [per user read/unread data set] has changed, the read/unread data record is written back to the disk on the replica and on the user’s home server, with the replica’s GUID written over the existing Per\_User\_GUID.” When changes are propagated from this server, the Per\_User\_GUID would now represent the new originating server.

Applicant’s interpretation of the broad language of the claim also appears to read on the GUID as discussed in column 5, lines 6 – 9 “In the preferred embodiment, a change number consists of a globally unique ID (GUID) of the server on which the change was made, plus a unique sequence number assigned by the server.” The GUID represents the server on which the change was made, which would be the originating server. In light of the above sections, examiner is not persuaded that the **Benson** reference does not anticipate the language of the independent claims.

20. The second argument is related to the second part of the independent claims. Examiner is also not persuaded by the argument. If the originating server, represented by the Per\_User\_GUID, is different from that of the replica server then the data is copied, if it is the same, then no action is required, and replication is prevented. This is interpreted to mean that the server with the change to propagate – the one whose GUID is represented by Per\_User\_GUID - is not the same as the GUID of the server that is requesting the updated information, then the information is copied. If the GUID is the same as the Per\_User\_GUID, then bounce-back prevention occurs, by taking no action. Examiner feels this to be a fair interpretation of the claim; therefore the claim language does not appear to be distinguishable over **Benson**.

21. Lastly, Applicant notes that “this process is not initiated by a replica...” but rather when a user opens a folder on a client. Examiner’s interpretation of the reference in light of the claim language is that by opening the folder on the client, the client is then the receiving server, and therefore it is the replica (or receiving) server which is initiating the process.

### ***Conclusion***

22. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2167

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2167


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis L. Vautrot whose telephone number is 571-272-2184. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dv

16 November 2006

  
JOHN COTTINGHAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

*h. h.*